

February 23, 2005

Ms. Margo Kaiser Staff Attorney Texas Workforce Commission 101 E. 15th Street Austin, Texas 78778-0001

OR2005-01612

Dear Ms. Kaiser:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 218966

The Texas Workforce Commission (the "commission") received a request for any information related to claims filed by a named individual against any of his employers. You state that the commission will release some of the requested information. However, you claim that the case analysis is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002).

First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel,

such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, id. 503(b)(1), meaning it was "not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication." Id. 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state that the case analysis is a confidential communication between commission appeals attorneys and employees of the commission. You also state that the case analysis was made in confidence, is intended for the sole use of the commission, and has not been shared or distributed to others. Based on our review of your representations and the submitted information, we find that you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the case analysis. Accordingly, we conclude that the commission may withhold the case analysis pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. As our ruling on this issue is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument.

Furthermore, this letter ruling shall serve as a previous determination under section 552.301 of the Act that a confidential case analysis prepared by commission appeals attorneys in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the commission is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (f); see also Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). However, this previous determination does not cover the situation in which other law may require the case analysis to be disclosed. See, e.g., 20 C.F.R. pt. 603; UI Program Letter 34-97. Thus, so long as the elements of law, fact and circumstances do not change so as to no longer support the findings set forth above and unless otherwise authorized to release according to law, the commission need not ask for a decision from this office again with respect to this type of information requested of the commission under Chapter 552 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (f); see also Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the

governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Jaclyn N. Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JNT/krl

Ref: ID# 218966

Ms. Margo Kaiser - Page 4

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Martha Worner
Baker Botts LLP
One Shell Plaza
910 Louisiana
Houston, Texas 77002-4995
(w/o enclosures)